\_

ORDER - 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

ALEC L. MANGALIMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C11-1591RSM

ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS

This matter is before the Court for consideration of plaintiff's motion for leave to depose defendant Washington State Department of Transportation ("WSDOT") and motion to continue defendant's motion for summary judgment. Dkt. # 63, 65. Plaintiff asserts that he was unable to depose defendant WSDOT until production of documents was complete, and that defendants' May 30, 2013 production of over 800 additional pages (after the discovery deadline)<sup>1</sup> has necessitated these motions. Although defendants have opposed the motions, the Court finds that it is in the interest of justice to allow plaintiff to fully develop and present the facts supporting his employment discrimination

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Production of documents was delayed in part by the parties' efforts to develop a stipulated protective order regarding confidentiality of documents. The proposed protective order was rejected by the Court on May 24, 2013, for failure to comply with Local Rule LCR 26(c). Dkt. # 51. Defendants subsequently produced the requested documents.

claim.

The parties have stipulated to continue the trial date in this matter so that the summary judgment motion can be considered before they start final pre-trial preparation. Dkt. # 79. Thus it will not interfere with the trial date to allow plaintiff additional time to gather facts he needs to oppose summary judgment. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for leave to depose defendant WSDOT (Dkt. # 63) and plaintiff's motion for a continuance of defendants' summary judgment motion (Dkt. # 65) are both GRANTED. Plaintiff shall have until September 20, 2013 to depose defendant WSDOT. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 52) shall be RE-NOTED on the Court's calendar for October 11, 2013. Plaintiff's supplemental response shall be due October 7, 2013, and defendants may file a reply on or before October 14, 2013.<sup>2</sup>

DATED this 23 day of August 2013.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

 $<sup>^2</sup>$ October 11, 2013 is a federal holiday, so defendants' reply is not due until the following Monday. Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(a)(1)(C).

ORDER - 2